

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 045 746

UD 010 863

AUTHOR Stollar, Dewey H.; Dykes, Archie R.
 TITLE Report of Two Short-Term Training Institutes for School Superintendents and School Board Members.
 INSTITUTION Memphis State Univ., Tenn. School of Education.; Tennessee Univ., Knoxville. Coll. of Education.
 SPONS AGENCY Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
 PUB DATE 65
 CONTRACT CEC-5-37-003
 NOTE 39p.
 EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.25 HC-\$2.05
 DESCRIPTORS Administrative Personnel, *Administrative Problems, Administrator Attitudes, *Administrator Role, Boards of Education, *Government Role, *Institutes (Training Programs), Participant Involvement, Program Evaluation, *School Integration, School Superintendents

ABSTRACT

This is a report of two two-day institutes which were designed to encourage increased and more effective activity in school desegregation in the Southeastern region. Each participant received copies of desegregation guidelines and a set of publications for essential background information. Kickoff speakers focused attention on progress in desegregation in the participants' regions, followed by a panel discussion. Federal legislation on civil rights and local requirements were discussed. Selected examples of what some schools had done were presented to show how some superintendents had overcome problems. The final portion of the program both summarizes and seeks to establish future courses of action based on the participants' expressed needs. (Author/DM)

ED0 45746

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION
& WELFARE

OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED
EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR
ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF
VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECES-
SARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDU-
CATION POSITION OR POLICY

Report of
TWO SHORT-TERM TRAINING INSTITUTES FOR SCHOOL
SUPERINTENDENTS AND SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS

Contract No. OE 5-37-003

P.L. 81-152, Title III, Section 302(c) (15), and

P.L. 88-352, Title IV, Section 404

Civil Rights Act of 1964

Conducted by the
College of Education
The University of Tennessee
at Memphis (March 26-28)
and
at Knoxville (April 2-4, 1965)

In Cooperation With
The United States Office of Education

Dewey H. Stollar and Archie R. Dykes
Directors and Authors of Report

UD010863

INSTITUTE DIRECTORS

Dewey H. Stollar	Assistant Professor of Education The University of Tennessee
Archie R. Dykes	Professor of Education and Director of the University of Tennessee-Memphis State University Center for Advanced Graduate Study in Education

SPECIAL CONSULTANTS

Joseph Bongo	Co-Director, Madison Area Project Madison Junior High School Syracuse, New York
C. W. Bradburn	Superintendent, Transylvania County Schools Brevard, North Carolina
Bennie Carmichael	Superintendent, Chattanooga City Schools
Ernest W. Cotten	Former Executive Secretary Tennessee School Boards Association
Richard Day	Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Ohio State University Law School
William Foster	Professor, University of Wisconsin Law School
John Harris	Director, Nashville-Davidson County Schools
Stanley Kruger	Equal Educational Opportunities Program United States Office of Education
E. C. Merrill	Dean, College of Education The University of Tennessee
Michael Y. Nunnery	Associate Professor of Education The University of Tennessee
David Seeley	Equal Educational Opportunities Program United States Office of Education
E. C. Stimbert	Superintendent, Memphis City Schools
Donald Sullivan	Equal Educational Opportunities Program (Former) United States Office of Education
J. Howard Warf	Tennessee Commissioner of Education Nashville, Tennessee

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
I. PURPOSE	1
II. PROGRAMS OF THE INSTITUTES	2
III. PARTICIPANTS IN THE INSTITUTES	4
IV. ASSESSMENT OF THE INSTITUTES	4
Background Information	4
Evaluation of the Institutes by Participants	7
Comments by the Institute Staff	13
V. FOLLOW-UP STUDY OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS REPRESENTED IN THE INSTITUTES	16
APPENDIX A	
Letter of Invitation	18
APPENDIX B	
Programs for the Institutes	21
APPENDIX C	
Evaluative Instruments	30

REPORT ON TWO SHORT-TERM TRAINING INSTITUTES FOR SCHOOL
SUPERINTENDENTS AND SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS

I. PURPOSE

School desegregation and the problems incident thereto constitute the major challenge confronting educational leaders throughout the South today. The resolution of these problems requires the active concern of all who are engaged in the educational enterprise and the effective utilization of all available resources. The short-term institute in Memphis and Knoxville were hopefully steps toward the achievement of these objectives.

School desegregation had proceeded at an uneven pace in the six Southern states from which institute participants were invited. In Tennessee, for example, some school systems had been desegregated completely at the time of the institutes while others had not begun the desegregation process. In other states represented (Arkansas, Alabama, Kentucky, Mississippi, and Missouri) desegregation progress was sporadic. The institutes, therefore, were designed to encourage increased and more effective activity in school desegregation in the Southeastern region. This general purpose was to be achieved through accomplishment of the following specific objectives of the institutes:

1. To help participants understand the ramifications and implications of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the importance of immediately initiating and/or accelerating school desegregation in the school districts they represented;
2. To help participants understand how to proceed in initiating and carrying out school integration (securing necessary data, enlisting community support, and developing specific plans);
3. To help participants understand the implications of desegregation for curriculum and instruction;

4. To help participants understand the implications of desegregation for the inservice training of professional staff;

5. To inform participants of specific assistance available to them from the United States Office of Education and other sources as school desegregation is undertaken.

II. PROGRAMS OF THE INSTITUTES

Similar programs were developed and carried out in the institutes at Knoxville and Memphis. The same consultants and resource people were used where possible. Time allocations for the two institutes were identical; each began on a Friday afternoon and continued through Sunday afternoon. It was deemed essential to schedule the institutes on weekends in order to secure participation of board members. The Knoxville Institute followed the Memphis Institute by one week.

In order to provide the participants with essential background information, at the time of registration each was given copies of the institute's program and "Guidelines for Southern School Desegregation."¹ In addition, each school system represented at the institute received a set of selected publications: Learning Together: A Book on Integrated Education, The Poor Among Us, The Negro in America, A Guide to School Integration, and School Failures and Dropouts.

In opening sessions on Friday afternoon and evening, each institute featured one or more kickoff speakers who focused attention on progress and problems in school desegregation in the region from which the participants came. This aspect of the program was designed to establish the context for the

¹Prepared by G. W. Foster, Jr., Professor of Law at the University of Wisconsin and Consultant to the United States Office of Education.

remainder of the program and to lay out in broad relief the disparate levels of progress among school systems in close geographical proximity. Following this presentation, a panel endeavored to identify important points for further discussion.

On Saturday morning, the program moved into a discussion of the recently enacted federal legislation on civil rights with emphasis on the requirements placed on local school districts. Small group sessions following the general presentation in this area facilitated discussion and gave participants an opportunity to choose the specific subjects which they wished to hear discussed further.

The third major aspect of the program was focused on selected examples of what some school systems had done in the general area of desegregation. Topics of discussion included plans of desegregation, providing better educational opportunities for disadvantaged youth, inservice education programs, developing community support for desegregation, and resources available to local school districts in attacking the problems of school desegregation. This part of the program, positive in character, was designed to encourage the superintendents and board members and to provide specific information on how others had approached and overcome problems which they were currently facing.

The final part of the program was intended as a summary, but also sought to establish some future course of action based on needs expressed by the institute participants. The positive aspects of the institute were emphasized. An effort was again made to point out to the participants the many avenues of assistance open to them.

III. PARTICIPANTS IN THE INSTITUTES

The institute at Memphis was intended to serve school districts in West Tennessee, Eastern Arkansas, and Northern Mississippi; a few participants from Southeastern Missouri and Eastern Kentucky also attended. In this institute, 121 persons were enrolled (81 school superintendents and 40 board members). Also present were several representatives from institutions of higher education, a few community leaders, and school personnel other than superintendents and board members.

The institute at Knoxville enrolled 44 superintendents and 40 board members, a total of 84, from East Tennessee, Alabama, and North Carolina. In addition, 36 other persons were present for at least one session as program participants, resource persons, or interested onlookers.

IV. ASSESSMENT OF THE INSTITUTES

Background Information

Prior to the presentation of data reflecting the opinions of participants (superintendents and school board members) relative to the value of the institutes, background information is presented to provide a basis for understanding the status of school desegregation in the school districts represented and thus a framework for interpreting the opinions expressed by the institute participants.

Six states were represented in the two institutes--11 percent of the districts were located in Alabama, 12 percent in Arkansas, 1 percent in Kentucky, 15 percent in Mississippi, 11 percent in Missouri, and 50 percent in Tennessee. Relative to pupil enrollment, 43 percent² of the districts had less than 2,500

²Beginning at this point, all percentages are based on usable data provided by 83 of the 125 districts represented.

pupils; 27 percent had between 2,500-4,999 pupils; 19 percent had between 5,000-9,999; 7 percent had between 10,000-24,999; 2 percent had between 25,000-49,999; and 2 percent had over 50,000. At the time of the institute, 11 percent of the districts had no Negro pupils enrolled in the schools under district control. In 28 percent of the districts the Negro pupil enrollment was between 1-9 percent of the total pupil enrollment, in 6 percent of the districts it was between 10-19 percent, in 19 percent of the districts it was in the 20-29 percent category, in 7 percent of the districts it was between 30-39 percent, and in 29 percent of the districts the Negro pupil enrollment was in excess of 40 percent of the total enrollment.

In 22 percent of the districts, Negro pupils residing within the district boundaries attended schools in another district. In 33 percent of the districts, Negro pupils were enrolled in schools with white pupils. In 63 percent of the districts, no Negro pupils were enrolled in schools with white pupils. Four percent of the districts reported there were no Negro pupils residing within the district.

Of the districts having experienced some degree of desegregation, 66 percent were operating according to some type of "open" enrollment policy (either complete freedom of choice or freedom of choice with specified zones), 11 percent were proceeding according to some type of grade(s)-per-year plan, 16 percent enrolled Negroes in predominantly white schools upon formal request, and 7 percent were following some other plan (a court order in most instances). In 75 percent of the districts less than 10 percent of the Negro pupil population was enrolled in schools with white pupils; in 17 percent of the districts, 40 percent or more of the Negro population was enrolled in schools with white

pupils. The remaining districts (8 percent) were between the two extremes.

Of the districts which had experienced some degree of pupil desegregation, none had Negro teachers employed in schools where white teachers were employed. However, roughly half of these districts reported consideration of plans for staff desegregation. These plans fall into two broad categories: (1) gradual introduction of Negro staff members to predominantly white schools, and (2) assignment of staff on the basis of need and qualifications without regard to race. However, it should be noted that in several instances the districts reported that the Negro teachers currently employed were as a group very poorly prepared. This presented a perceived barrier to staff desegregation.

Of the districts which had some degree of pupil desegregation, 70 percent reported plans to extend pupil desegregation. Most often these plans involved (1) "speed-up" of grade(s)-per-year plans and (2) elimination of existing all-Negro schools (which often were small rural schools).

Among the districts having experienced some degree of pupil desegregation, practically all reported that the achievement of the Negro pupils as a group was below that of the white pupil group. This was perceived to be the basis for the major instructional difficulties faced in desegregated schools. The "achievement gap" was reported as being greatest in reading. Other frequently reported instructional problems related to: (1) traditional methods used by white teachers being ineffective with Negro pupils, (2) poor communication between white teachers and Negro pupils, (3) difficulties in grouping according to achievement since the Negro pupils tended to dominate the low-achiever groups, and (4) limited experiences of the Negro pupils. In some few instances problems related to lack of acceptance of the Negro pupils by the white pupils and lack of participation of Negro pupils in extracurricular activities were reported.

Of the districts which had no pupil desegregation at the time of the institutes, 41 percent reported that no plans for pupil desegregation were currently being formulated or that plans were under discussion but indefinite; 35 percent reported serious consideration of plans; and 24 percent had adopted plans. Of the districts which had adopted or were seriously considering plans, the methods most frequently mentioned were: (1) establishment of school zones for all pupils without regard to race, (2) some combination of freedom of choice and zoning, (3) freedom of choice, and (4) grade(s)-per-year. The last took various forms including all elementary grades one year and all high school grades the next or vice versa, two to four grades per year starting at either the first or twelfth grades or with selected grades at all levels. In isolated instances the plan took the form of awaiting a court order.

Evaluation of the Institutes by Participants

At the close of each of the institutes, participating school board members and superintendents were asked to express their opinions regarding the value of the general sessions, small group meetings, and procedures used in the institute. Also, they were asked to identify significant "facts" or ideas acquired which were pertinent to problems in their respective districts and to suggest individuals and/or subjects they would like included at future institutes.

Table I shows a distribution of the ratings³ as to quality and relevance assigned by participants for each of the general session presentations. "Quality" referred to the relative excellence of the presentation in regard to logic, clarity, content, and organization. "Relevance" referred to the extent to which the presentation was pertinent to the problems faced in the district represented. From an inspection of Table I it is noted that:

³All percentages in this section are based on usable data provided by 105 participants.

TABLE I

RATINGS ASSIGNED BY PARTICIPATING SUPERINTENDENTS AND BOARD MEMBERS
TO THE QUALITY AND RELEVANCE OF PRESENTATIONS MADE
AT THE INSTITUTES' GENERAL SESSIONS

	Criterion	Percent of Participants																	
		Memphis Section Ratings ^a						Knoxville Section Ratings ^a						Total Ratings ^a					
		1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
Implications of the Civil Rights Act for Tennessee Schools	Q ^b	22	24	24	22	8	-	26	40	30	2	-	2	24	31	27	13	4	1
	R ^b	30	21	25	5	5	14	38	26	30	2	-	4	33	23	27	4	3	9
Progress and problems in school desegregation in the Mid-South	Q	79	14	5	2	-	-	54	38	4	-	2	2	68	24	5	1	1	1
	R	57	21	12	5	5	-	33	33	19	4	7	4	46	26	15	5	6	2
Developing a plan of desegregation	Q	36	20	24	15	5	-	19	54	21	2	-	4	28	34	23	10	3	2
	R	25	19	24	17	8	7	33	30	28	2	-	7	28	24	25	11	5	7
The Equal Educational Opportunities Program	Q	34	24	24	10	7	1	35	35	19	2	7	2	34	28	22	7	7	2
	R	54	20	10	10	4	2	42	26	16	7	7	2	49	22	13	9	5	2
Providing better opportunities for disadvantaged youth	Q	33	30	10	9	9	9	33	29	25	4	2	7	33	30	16	7	6	8
	R	9	5	16	17	19	34	33	21	12	14	10	10	19	12	14	16	15	24
Resources available to school officials relative to desegregation problems	Q	25	25	31	11	4	4	36	41	21	-	-	2	30	31	27	7	2	3
	R	31	29	25	7	4	4	46	38	12	2	-	2	36	33	20	5	3	3
Additional programs which might be of value in school desegregation problems	Q	38	34	14	12	2	-	65	33	2	-	-	-	50	33	9	7	1	-
	R	43	27	16	14	-	-	63	35	2	-	-	-	52	30	10	8	-	-

^aA rating of "1" was the highest possible and "6" the lowest possible on the scale used.

^bQ = quality of the presentation; R = relevance of the presentation.

1. Using the quality criterion, the presentation entitled "Implications of the Civil Rights Act for Tennessee Schools" received positive⁴ ratings from 70 percent of the Memphis participants and 96 percent of the Knoxville participants. Using the criterion of relevance, the equivalent percentages were 76 and 94, respectively.

2. The presentation, "Progress and Problems in School Desegregation in the Mid-South," received positive ratings on quality from 98 percent of the Memphis group and 96 percent of the Knoxville group. Positive ratings on relevance were assigned by 90 percent of the Memphis group and 85 percent of the Knoxville group.

3. Positive ratings on quality were assigned by 80 percent of the Memphis group and 96 percent of the Knoxville group to the presentation, "Developing a Plan of Desegregation." The equivalent percentages for relevance were 68 and 91.

4. The presentation, "The Equal Educational Opportunities Program" was rated positively on quality by 82 percent of the Memphis participants and 89 percent of the Knoxville participants. On relevance, the equivalent percentages were 84 and 84.

5. Using the quality criterion, 73 percent of the Memphis group and 87 percent of the Knoxville group assigned positive ratings to the presentation, "Providing Better Opportunities for Disadvantaged Youth." Using the relevance criterion, this presentation was rated positively by 30 percent of the Memphis group and 66 percent by the Knoxville group.

6. The presentation, "Resources Available to School Officials Relative to Desegregation Problems," received positive quality ratings from 81 percent of the Memphis group and 98 percent of the Knoxville group. Positive relevance ratings were assigned by 85 percent of the Memphis group and 96 percent of the Knoxville group.

⁴A rating of 1, 2, or 3 is defined as "positive"; a rating of 4, 5, or 6 is defined as "negative."

7. The presentation, "Additional Programs Which Might Be of Value in School Desegregation Problems," (the final presentation and, in fact, more of a recapitulation) received positive ratings on quality from 86 percent of the Memphis participants and 100 percent of the Knoxville participants. Using the criterion of relevance, the equivalent percentages were also 86 and 100.

Considering both quality and relevance, the participants were asked to identify the single general session presentation they considered "most effective" and the single presentation considered "least effective." Of the Memphis group, 43 percent identified "Progress and Problems in School Desegregation in the Mid-South" as the most effective and 28 percent chose "The Equal Educational Opportunities Program." No other presentation was identified as most effective by more than 13 percent of that group. The presentation "Providing Better Opportunities for Disadvantaged Youth" was named as the least effective by 52 percent of the Memphis group. No other presentation was identified by more than 18 percent of the group as being least effective. There was lack of agreement among Knoxville participants regarding the most effective presentation. The four most frequently identified as most effective were: "The Equal Educational Opportunities Program" (26 percent), "Progress and Problems in School Desegregation in the Mid-South" (17 percent), "Developing a Plan of Desegregation" (17 percent), and "Providing Better Opportunities for Disadvantaged Youth" (17 percent). Named least effective by the Knoxville group were: "Providing Better Opportunities for Disadvantaged Youth" (32 percent) and "The Equal Educational Opportunities Program" (26 percent). No other presentation was identified by more than 16 percent of the Knoxville group as least effective. Combined ratings of participants in both institutes showed that the presentations identified as most effective were "Progress and Problems in School Desegregation in the Mid-South" (32 percent),

"The Equal Educational Opportunities Program" (27 percent). "Providing Better Programs for Disadvantaged Youth" was named the least effective presentation (43 percent in the combined ratings).

Since extensive use was made of panels, reaction regarding their effectiveness was sought. The percentage distribution of the responses was as follows:

<u>Response</u>	<u>Knoxville</u>	<u>Memphis</u>	<u>Total</u>
1. Very worthwhile, should be used more in such situations	53%	47%	50%
2. Worthwhile, but their use should not be expanded	35	42	39
3. Of value, but their use should be more restricted	12	11	11
4. Added little, for the most part should be discontinued	--	--	--

Reactions also were sought to the procedure of permitting general session speakers and panelists to be questioned from the floor. The percentage distribution of the responses was as follows:

<u>Response</u>	<u>Knoxville</u>	<u>Memphis</u>	<u>Total</u>
1. Very worthwhile, should be done more in such situations	74%	70%	72%
2. Worthwhile, but should not be done too often	16	25	21
3. Of some value, but often questions were not of general interest	10	5	7
4. A waste of time	--	--	--

The participants were asked two questions regarding the small group sessions. First, they were asked how they like the way the small groups were organized (by district size and problems). No person responded negatively to the organizational procedure. Second, the participants were asked for a general evaluation of the small group sessions. The percentage distribution of the responses to the second question was as follows:

<u>Response</u>	<u>Knoxville</u>	<u>Memphis</u>	<u>Total</u>
1. Very worthwhile, should have had more	76%	73%	74%
2. Worthwhile, but enough time was devoted to them	21	27	25
3. Interesting, but of little real worth	3	--	1
4. A waste of time	--	--	--

When the participants were asked to consider all activities collectively and rate the overall quality of the institute, the percentage distribution of the responses was as follows:

<u>Response</u>	<u>Knoxville</u>	<u>Memphis</u>	<u>Total</u>
1. Very helpful to me	91%	85%	88%
2. Of some value to me	9	11	10
3. Interesting, but offered me little	--	4	2
4. A waste of time	--	--	--

As another means of determining the overall value of the institutes to the attending board members and superintendents, each was requested to identify three significant (in terms of local problems) facts or ideas which had been acquired during the institute. The pattern of responses for the Memphis and Knoxville groups was almost identical. The points most frequently mentioned are typified by the following quotes:

The idea of a dual school system must be dismissed from our minds.

Made us realize the urgency of the situation.

I now understand the meaning of Form 441 and the necessity for developing detailed plans as well as signing the 441.

I formed definite ideas regarding a plan for my district.

We were given a new meaning of the term 'will comply,' did not know this meant both present and future.

I have a better awareness of the types and sources of help available.

The USOE is not settled as to what will be approved or disapproved.

The USOE is realizing the complexity of the many differences in local communities.

Staff desegregation is an immediate problem.

I must involve a cross-section of the leadership in the community.

It is important to convince board members of the importance of working with the Civil Rights Act.

It has brought realization of the need to help, or get help, for faculties so instruction may be improved in the face of desegregation.

Following are listings of personnel and subjects suggested for future institutes by a majority of the participants:

Personnel

Non-school-connected city and county officials (prescribed local leadership);

Influential local lay persons (ascribed local leadership);

Attorneys of local board of education;

A superintendent from the "Deep South" who has been through the desegregation process in his district.

Subjects

Format and specifics for developing local board requests to the United States Office of Education for financial support of projects;

Plans and problems of staff desegregation;

Plans and problems related to desegregation of services such as transportation;

Curriculum and instructional modifications needed and possible in the rural and urban South.

Comments by the Institute Staff

The following comments by the evaluator are based on an analysis of the data presented in the preceding sections, attendance at both the Memphis and Knoxville institutes, and numerous personal conversations with participating superintendents and board members. That is, even though the comments which follow are intended to assist in interpreting the data and planning for future institutes, it must be recognized that they reflect to some degree other perceptions acquired by the evaluator while associated with the two institutes.

1. Findings of other evaluative studies indicate that--regardless of the situation--roughly 70 percent of the responses relative to the phenomenon being evaluated can be expected to be positive. Since there were only two instances of less than 70 percent positive responses and in most instances the percentage of positive responses was considerably above that level, it must be concluded that from the point of view of the participants each institute as a whole was a worthwhile endeavor. Unsolicited verbal comments from the participants plus positive action by selected groups and individuals support this generalization.

2. Both the data presented and verbal comments indicate that there was considerable diversity of opinion relative to individual presentations. Certainly, much of this was to be expected. In this case, however, differences of opinion regarding individual presentations were probably magnified by pre-existing differences among the school districts represented in regard to location, size, percentage of Negro pupils, and status regarding desegregation. For example, the presentation "Providing Better Opportunities for Disadvantaged Youth" was assigned the lowest possible rating (6) on the relevance criterion by 34 percent of the participants at Memphis and only 9 percent of this group assigned the highest rating (1) to this presentation. (Relatively fewer of the districts represented at Memphis had actually experienced desegregation.) Yet, among the Knoxville group this same presentation received a relevance rating of 6 from only 10 percent of the participants and 33 percent rated it highest on relevance. (Considerably more of the districts represented at Knoxville had experienced some degree of desegregation.) The implication for future institutes can best be stated in the form of a question: Would the effectiveness of such an institute be enhanced if there was a deliberate effort in the selection process to insure more homogeneity among the districts to be represented?

3. The data presented indicate that approximately three-fourths of the participants desired more small-group discussions. Observations and unsolicited comments certainly reinforced the conviction that the small-group discussions were of great value. However, it should be noted that the small-group sessions were subjected to considerable structure, leadership responsibilities were fixed, and competent resource people were present. It is suggested that these conditions were basic to the success of the small groups and similar conditions should prevail if more use of small groups is made in future institutes.

4. Verbal comments and, to some degree, the data gathered by means of the assessment opinionnaire led to the conclusion that the sympathetic--but straightforward and pointed--approach adopted by some of the USOE representatives was greatly appreciated by the institute participants. It is suggested that this kind of approach by USOE representatives will continue to be effective in the Southeastern region.

5. Considering the data, observations, and status of desegregation in the area, it is suggested that possible future institutes might place emphasis on:

- (a) An orientation for prescribed and ascribed non-school leaders from districts where no desegregation has occurred or the degree of desegregation is very slight;
- (b) The possible approaches and problems related to staff desegregation (participants to include superintendents, personnel directors, supervisors, and principals from districts where considerable progress has been made in pupil, but not staff, desegregation);
- (c) Classroom methodology and materials for the culturally deprived (participants to include teachers, instructional supervisors, materials supervisors, and principals).

V. FOLLOW-UP STUDY OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS REPRESENTED IN THE INSTITUTES

In late September 1965, a follow-up survey of the districts represented in the institutes was conducted by means of a questionnaire which was designed to determine progress in pupil and staff desegregation and interest in future "short-term" institutes. Usable data were provided by 115 (92 percent) of the 125 districts represented in the institutes.

Of the responding districts, 12 percent reported that no Negro pupils were enrolled in schools with white pupils during either the 1964-65 or the 1965-66 school year. Since, however, 6 percent of the districts had only one race represented within their geographic boundaries, of the districts wherein desegregation was possible, only 6 percent had not begun the desegregation process (as opposed to 67 percent in the Spring 1965).

In 31 percent of the responding school districts, Negro pupils were enrolled with white pupils during both school years (1964-65 and 1965-66), while in 57 percent of the districts, desegregation had not been undertaken prior to the 1965-66 school year. Among the districts having pupil desegregation, 77 percent had less than 10 percent of the Negro pupil population enrolled in schools where white pupils were also enrolled (compared to 75 percent in the Spring 1965) while 11 percent of the desegregated districts had 40 percent or more of the Negro pupil population enrolled in schools where white pupils were also enrolled (compared to 17 percent in the Spring 1965).

The United States Office of Education had accepted the "court order," "plan," or "assurance of compliance" relating to pupil desegregation as submitted by 95 percent of the responding districts.

When asked if Negro teachers were employed to work directly with white pupils, 23 percent of the districts replied "yes" and 77 percent replied "no." (In the Spring 1965, no staff desegregation had taken place.) Among the districts where there was no staff desegregation, 10 percent reported plans for staff desegregation during either the 1965-66 or 1966-67 school year, 53 percent were "undecided," and 37 percent had no plans.

An interest in future "short-term" institutes was indicated by 79 percent of the districts. As discussion topics for future institutes, 33 percent chose "Development of Local Board Project Requests to USOE"; 26 percent, "Plans and Problems Related to Staff Desegregation"; 25 percent, "Curriculum and Instructional Modifications"; 13 percent, "Ramifications of School Desegregation for Local Community Leaders"; and 3 percent "Desegregation of Services."

APPENDIX A

Letter of Invitation

Dear Superintendent:

Your school system has been suggested as having an active interest in considering the ramifications of the Civil Rights legislation. Because of this interest, you and one of your board members are cordially invited to attend a Short-Term Institute regarding the implications of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. The Civil Rights Institute which was requested by many superintendents and board members will be offered in two sections, one in Memphis and the other in Knoxville, to make possible the broadest coverage of the State of Tennessee and surrounding areas. You and your board member are invited to the institute that is closer to you. If you have a schedule conflict with one, please plan to attend the other and notify the director.

The Memphis Institute will be held at the Peabody Hotel and will start at 3:00 p.m. on Friday, March 26 and continue through the weekend until 3:30 p.m. Sunday, March 28. You are requested to contact the Peabody Hotel for reservations. Dr. Archie R. Dykes, Director of the UT-MSU Center for Advanced Graduate Study in Education, Memphis State University, is director of the Memphis Institute.

The Knoxville Institute will be held in Room 101 of the Claxton Hall, University of Tennessee and will start at 3:00 p.m. on Friday, April 2 and continue until 3:30 p.m. Sunday, April 4. Dr. Dewey H. Stollar, Assistant Professor of Educational Administration and Supervision, College of Education, University of Tennessee, is director of the Knoxville Institute. People attending the Knoxville Institute are requested to make their own lodging reservations at the Andrew Johnson Hotel, Holiday Inn (Downtown), Farragut Hotel, Admiral Benbow Motel or any of the other fine lodging places located in Knoxville.

You and your board member will be paid a stipend of \$15.00 per day each for each day you attend the institute. In addition, one person from each school system will be paid mileage at the rate of nine cents (9¢) per mile for the distance encountered in coming to and returning from the institute; therefore, you both should travel in the same automobile. You will be paid for one round trip only. Funds are limited and if more people register to participate than the funds will support, applications will be taken in the order in which they are received. Other board members or staff members are welcome to attend, but we will be unable to pay their expenses.

The general purpose of this institute will be to help participants better understand the ramifications and implications of the Civil Rights Act. Specific purposes include:

- (a) To inform participants of the kind of help that is available to them from Washington if they wish to obtain it as they face the problem of school desegregation.
- (b) To help participants understand the kinds of problems their school systems will face regardless of the direction in which they move with respect to school desegregation.

- (c) To help participants understand the implications for curriculum and instruction which flow from school desegregation.
- (d) To help participants understand the implications school desegregation has for the in-service training of teachers.

Enclosed you will find a post card for indicating whether you and one of your board members will be attending. Also, since this is your institute, please list in the allotted space some of the questions you might like to have considered in this institute.

A tentative program has been included for your consideration. We believe that after reviewing the fine array of programs and speakers you will see where this will help you in many ways. Please contact your board member about attending. It is imperative that we receive confirmation at the earliest possible date.

In closing let us welcome you and one of your board members to the institute.

Sincerely,

Dewey H. Stollar
Director, Knoxville Institute

Archie R. Dykes
Director, Memphis Institute

APPENDIX B

Programs for the Institutes

at Memphis
(March 26-28, 1965)

and

at Knoxville
(April 2-4, 1965)

KNOXVILLE INSTITUTE PROGRAM

Friday, April 2, 1965

3:00	Registration -- Room 101, Claxton Hall
3:30	Greetings Andrew D. Holt President University of Tennessee
3:45	Address IMPLICATIONS OF CIVIL RIGHTS ACT FOR TENNESSEE SCHOOLS J. Howard Warf Tennessee Commissioner of Education
4:45	Address PROGRESS AND PROBLEMS IN SCHOOL DESEGREGATION IN THE MID-SOUTH Bennie Carmichael Superintendent Chattanooga City Schools
5:45	Dinner
7:00-9:00	Panel Discussion REACTION TO PREVIOUS PRESENTATIONS Moderator and Member: Homer F. Mincy Superintendent Greeneville City Schools Panel Members: W. E. Cole Professor of Sociology University of Tennessee Ohmer Milton Professor of Psychology University of Tennessee Raymond Witt Former Chattanooga Board Member

Saturday, April 3, 1965

9:00-10:00

Presentation

DEVELOPING A PLAN OF DESEGREGATION

C. W. Bradburn
Superintendent
Transylvania County Schools
Brevard, North Carolina

10:00-10:30

Panel Discussion

REACTION TO ABOVE PLAN OF DESEGREGATION AND SUGGEST
OTHER POSSIBLE DEVELOPMENTS

Moderator and Member:

Edd Williams
Superintendent
Oneida Special District

Panel Members:

Mildred Doyle
Superintendent
Knox County Schools

Alex Shaffer
Knoxville City Board Member

Ethel Metcalf
Cumberland County Board Member

10:30-12:00

Address

PROVIDING BETTER OPPORTUNITIES FOR DISADVANTAGED
YOUTH

Joseph Bongo, Co-Director
Madison Area Project
Madison Junior High School
Syracuse, New York

1:00-3:00

Address

THE EQUAL EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES PROGRAM

Stanley Kruger
Equal Educational Opportunities Program
U. S. Office of Education

Richard Day
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
Ohio State University Law School

Sunday, April 4, 1965

8:00-9:00

Small group discussions of special desegregation problems (Groups organized by interests and by size of school system)

9:00-11:00

Panel Discussion

RESOURCES AVAILABLE TO SCHOOL OFFICIALS RELATIVE TO DESEGREGATION PROBLEMS

Moderator:

Orin B. Graff, Head
Educational Administration and Supervision
University of Tennessee

Panel Members:

Ralph Martin
Director of Technical Teaching Center
Knoxville College

Stanley Kruger
Equal Educational Opportunities Program
U. S. Office of Education

Agnes Bird
Tennessee Advisory Committee of the United States
Civil Rights Commission

Lawrence H. Gangaware
Psychiatric Social Worker

Questions to the resource experts

Presiding:

Orin B. Graff, Head
Educational Administration and Supervision
University of Tennessee

11:00-1:00

ADDITIONAL PROGRAMS WHICH MIGHT BE OF VALUE IN SCHOOL DESEGREGATION PROBLEMS

E. C. Merrill
Dean, College of Education
University of Tennessee

Stanley Kruger
Equal Educational Opportunities Program
U. S. Office of Education

1:00

EVALUATION

Michael Y. Nunnery
Associate Professor
Educational Administration and Supervision
University of Tennessee

MEMPHIS INSTITUTE PROGRAM

Friday, March 26, 1965

3:00	Registration
3:45	Greetings George Barnes Superintendent Shelby County Schools
4:00	Address IMPLICATIONS OF CIVIL RIGHTS ACT FOR TENNESSEE SCHOOLS J. Howard Warf Tennessee Commissioner of Education
5:00	Address PROGRESS AND PROBLEMS IN SCHOOL DESEGREGATION IN THE MID-SOUTH E. C. Stimbert Superintendent Memphis City Schools
6:00	Dinner
7:00-9:00	Panel REACTION TO PREVIOUS PRESENTATION Moderator Sam Johnson, Dean School of Education Memphis State University Panel Members Ohmer Milton Professor of Psychology University of Tennessee Frank Grisham, Member Nashville-Davidson County Board of Education Ray Henry Superintendent of Schools Gideon, Missouri Harry F. Hodge Assistant Professor of Education University of Tennessee

Saturday, March 27, 1965

8:00

Presiding
Julius Hurst
Superintendent
McNairy County Schools

Greetings
Ernest W. Cotten
Executive Secretary
Tennessee School Boards Association

Address

THE EQUAL EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES PROGRAM
David Seeley
Equal Educational Opportunities Program
U. S. Office of Education

9:45

Break

10:00

Presiding
W. O. Warren
Superintendent of Schools
Dyersburg, Tennessee

Address

PROVIDING BETTER OPPORTUNITIES FOR DISADVANTAGED
YOUTH
Joseph Bongo, Co-Director
Madison Area Project
Madison Junior High School
Syracuse, New York

12:00

Lunch

1:30

Small Group Discussions

Presiding
William Sadler
Superintendent of Schools
Humboldt, Tennessee

THE NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE EXPERIENCE
John Harris, Director
Nashville-Davidson County Schools

Presiding
Floyd Hamlett
Superintendent
School District R-3
Pemiscot County, Missouri

TITLE VI OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS ACT
William Foster
Professor
University of Wisconsin Law School

Presiding
James Walker
Superintendent
Madison County Schools

PREPARING THE SCHOOL AND COMMUNITY FOR DESEGREGATION
E. C. Stimbert
Superintendent
Memphis City Schools

Presiding
Herbert Carter
Superintendent of Schools
Marion, Arkansas

FURTHER DISCUSSION OF MR. KRUGER'S PRESENTATION
David Seeley
Equal Educational Opportunities Program
U. S. Office of Education

Sunday, March 28, 1965

8:00-9:00

Presiding
E. A. Cox
Superintendent
Maury County Schools

Address

DEVELOPING AND IMPLEMENTING A PLAN OF DESEGREGATION
Floyd Parsons
Superintendent of Schools
Little Rock, Arkansas

Panel Discussion

REACTIONS AND SUPPLEMENTAL PRESENTATIONS

George Barnes
Superintendent
Shelby County Schools

W. D. Tommey
Superintendent of Schools
Blytheville, Arkansas

C. A. Johnson
Superintendent of Schools
Starkville, Mississippi

John W. Mullins
Superintendent of Schools
Newport, Arkansas

9:00-11:00

Presiding
William Sanford, Director
Clarksville-Montgomery County Schools

Panel Discussion

RESOURCES AVAILABLE TO SCHOOL OFFICIALS FACING
DESEGREGATION PROBLEMS

Moderator
Orin B. Graff, Head
Educational Administration and Supervision
University of Tennessee

Panel Members
Mrs. Ruby Martin
U. S. Commission on Civil Rights

Donald Sullivan
Equal Educational Opportunities Program
U. S. Office of Education

Hugh Murphy
National Conference of Christians and Jews

Carl Carson
Memphis Committee on Community Relations

Questions to the resource experts

11:00-1:00

Presiding
Shannon Faulkner
Superintendent
Tipton County Schools

FURTHER ASSISTANCE WITH PROBLEMS OF DESEGREGATION

E. C. Merrill, Dean
College of Education
University of Tennessee

Donald Sullivan
Equal Educational Opportunities Program
U. S. Office of Education

1:00

EVALUATION

Michael Y. Nunnery
Associate Professor
Educational Administration and Supervision
University of Tennessee

APPENDIX C

Evaluative Instruments

ASSESSMENT OF INSTITUTE*

Your Position: Superintendent
Board Member

A. Total Group Meetings (General Sessions)

1. Following is a listing of the major presentations made in the institute. You are requested to "rate" each presentation in the space provided using two criteria. First, rate the quality of the presentation. (In this case, quality refers to the relative excellence of the presentation in regard to sound logic, clarity, content, and organization.) Second, rate the relevance of the presentation. (In this case, relevance refers to the extent to which the presentation had meaning or was pertinent to the problems faced in your school district in regard to desegregation.) It is reasoned that you may judge some presentations to be of very high quality but lacking in real meaning for you in your situation or visa versa. (Check (x) as you deem appropriate.)

- (a) "Implications of the Civil Rights Act for Tennessee Schools (Warf)

quality						relevance					
very high			very low			very high			very low		

- ** (b) "Progress and Problems in School Desegregation in the Mid-South" (Carmichael plus panel)

quality						relevance					
very high			very low			very high			very low		

- *** (c) "Developing a Plan of Desegregation" (Bradburn plus panel)

quality						relevance					
very high			very low			very high			very low		

- (d) "Providing Better Opportunities for Disadvantaged Youth" (Bongo)

quality						relevance					
very high			very low			very high			very low		

- (e) "Discussion of Title VI of Civil Rights" (Kruger)

quality						relevance					
very high			very low			very high			very low		

*Used in the Memphis Institute

**Stimbert plus panel

***Parsons plus panel

- (f) "Resources Available to School Officials Relative to Desegregation Problems" (Panel chaired by Graff)

quality			relevance		
very high		very low	very high		very low

- (g) "Additional Programs Which Might Be of Value in School Desegregation Problems" (Merrill and Kruger)

quality			relevance		
very high		very low	very high		very low

2. Considering both quality and relevance, which single presentation would you rate as most effective? (The letters below refer to the presentations as listed in Question 1. Circle your choice.) a b c d e f g
3. Considering both quality and relevance, which single presentation would you rate as least effective? (The letters below refer to the presentations as listed in Question 1. Circle your choice.) a b c d e f g
4. What did you think of the use of panels in the general sessions? (Check your reaction below.)
 - ☐ Very worthwhile, should be used more in such situations
 - ☐ Worthwhile, but their use should not be expanded
 - ☐ Of value, but their use should be more restricted
 - ☐ Added little, for the most part they should be discontinued
5. What did you think of the technique of questioning the speaker from the floor? (Check your reaction below)
 - ☐ Very worthwhile, should be done more in such situations
 - ☐ Worthwhile, but should not be done too often
 - ☐ Of some value, but often questions were not of general interest
 - ☐ A waste of time

B. Small Group Discussion

6. Did you like the way the small groups were organized (by district size and problems)? (Check your answer below)
 - ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ I have no comparative basis for making a judgment
7. In general how did you feel about the small group session? (Check your reaction below)
 - ☐ Very worthwhile, should have had more
 - ☐ Worthwhile, but enough time was devoted to them
 - ☐ Interesting, but of little real worth
 - ☐ A waste of time

C. General

8. Considering all activities, the institute was: (Check your response below)

- ☐ Very helpful to me
☐ Of some value to me
☐ Interesting, but offered me little
☐ A waste of time

9. Considering the institute as a whole, list below three "facts" or ideas you acquired which have the most meaning in terms of the plans and problems of your district in regard to desegregation.

(1) _____

(2) _____

(3) _____

10. If other institutes of this kind were to be held, what persons and/or subjects would you like to see considered?

If you have additional comments of any kind you would like to make about the institute, please feel free to do so below.

SUPERINTENDENT'S QUESTIONNAIRE*

1. Location of district:

☐ Alabama ☐ Arkansas ☐ Mississippi ☐ Missouri ☐ Tennessee

2. Pupil enrollment in the district:

☐ under 2500	☐ 10,000-24,999
☐ 2500-4999	☐ 25,000-49,999
☐ 5000-9999	☐ over 50,000

3. Percentage of pupils enrolled in the district who are Negro:

☐ None	☐ 20-29%
☐ 1-9%	☐ 30-39%
☐ 10-19%	☐ over 40%

4. Are there Negro pupils who reside in the district but because of their race attend school in another district?

☐ Yes ☐ No

5. Are there Negro pupils actually enrolled in schools where white pupils are also enrolled?

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ None reside in district

If Question 5 was answered "No" please answer the following:

6. What is the status of the district's plans relative to pupil desegregation?

☐ There are currently no plans being formulated.
☐ Several ideas are being discussed but at present plans are indefinite.
☐ Serious consideration is being given to plans.
☐ Plans have been adopted.

7. If plans have been adopted or are under serious consideration, please explain briefly the nature of the plans. _____

*Used in Memphis Institute

If Question 5 was answered "Yes" please answer the following:

8. What is the nature of the desegregation plan in effect in the district?

- ☐ Complete "open" enrollment.
☐ "Open" enrollment within specified school zones.
☐ Proceeding according to "a grade(s)-a-year" plan.
☐ Enroll Negroes in "white" schools when they make a formal request.
☐ Other, please explain briefly _____

9. What is the approximate percent of Negro pupils in the district who are attending schools which also enroll white pupils? _____percent

10. Please list the major instructional problems encountered which seem to stem from white and Negro pupils being enrolled in the same school.

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____
4. _____

11.. Are there any Negro teachers employed in schools where there are also white teachers employed?

☐ Yes ☐ No

If "No" do you have or are you considering any plans for staff desegregation?
Please explain any plans. _____

12. Are you considering any plans to extend pupil desegregation in the district?

☐ Yes ☐ No

If "Yes" please explain briefly the nature of the plans. _____

SUPERINTENDENT'S FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONNAIRE

I. Check the answer that applies to your district:

- ☐ During the last school year there were no Negro pupils enrolled in schools where white pupils were also enrolled; during the present school year there are no Negro pupils enrolled in schools where white pupils are also enrolled.
- ☐ During the last school year there were no Negro pupils enrolled in schools where white pupils were also enrolled; during the present school year there are Negro pupils enrolled in schools where white pupils are also enrolled.
- ☐ During the last school year there were Negro pupils enrolled in schools where white pupils were also enrolled; during the present school year there are no Negro pupils enrolled in schools where white pupils are also enrolled.
- ☐ During the last school year there were Negro pupils enrolled in schools where white pupils were also enrolled; during the present school year there are Negro pupils enrolled in schools where white pupils are also enrolled.

II. If during the present school year there are Negro pupils enrolled in schools which also enrolled white pupils, what is the approximate percent of the Negro pupils in the district enrolled in schools where white pupils are also enrolled? _____ percent

III. Has your "plan for or assurance of compliance" with the 1964 Civil Rights Act as it relates to pupil desegregation been accepted by the U. S. Office of Education? ☐ Yes ☐ No

IV. Are there currently Negro teachers employed in situations where they are working directly with white pupils? ☐ Yes ☐ No

If "No" do you plan during this year or the next school year to employ any Negro teachers in situations where they will work directly with white pupils? ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Undecided

V. Are you interested in another "short-term" institute such as the one sponsored by the University of Tennessee in the Spring 1965? ☐ Yes ☐ No

If "Yes" which of the following topics would interest you most?

Check only one.

- ☐ Discussion of format and the specifics of developing local board requests to USOE for financial support of projects.
- ☐ Discussion of plans and problems of staff desegregation.
- ☐ Discussion related to desegregation of services such as transportation.
- ☐ Discussion of curriculum and instructional modifications needed and possible in the rural and urban South.
- ☐ Discussion of the ramifications of school desegregation for local community leaders.